UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,894	12/03/2004	Leonard H. Poll	GB 020089	2397

24737 7590 10/15/2007
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
SHAPIRO, LEONID	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2629	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,894	POLL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonid Shapiro	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-7 and 10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *4,8-9* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1,5,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews (US Patent No. 5,631,741) in view of Barsness et al. (7,103,848 B2).

As to claim 1, Matthews teaches an electronic device (See Col. 1, Lines 6-9), comprising:

a touch sensitive surface (See Fig. 1, item 10, Col. 2, Lines 41-43) for inputting strokes (See Fig. 1, item 10) forming at least one character (See Col. 2, Lines 1-12);

a memory (See Fig. 2, item 14, Col. 2, Lines 59-65); and

code for interpreting inputted strokes (See Col. 2, Lines 1-12) and storing the strokes in the memory in a vector graphics format (See Fig. 2, item 12, from Col. 2, Line 65 to Col. 3, Line 9).

Matthews does not disclose code for displaying the at least one character on a display as a vector graphics message; code for receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete; and code for adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message.

Barsness et al. teaches vector graphic image representative of the hand written notes made by a user (col. 8, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Barsness et al. into Matthews system to displaying the at least one character on a display as a vector graphics message; code for receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete; and code for adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message in order to display user created comments (messages) (col. 4, lines 3-16 in the Barsness et al. reference).

As to claim 5, Matthews teaches an input method for an electronic device (See Col. 1, Lines 6-9), including:

accepting a touch sensitive surface (See Fig. 1, item 10, Col. 2, Lines 41-43) for inputting strokes (See Fig. 1, item 10) forming at least one character (See Col. 2, Lines 1-12);

encoding the strokes entered in a vector graphic format (See Fig. 2, item 12, from Col. 2, Line 65 to Col. 3, Line 9);

storing the encoded strokes (See Fig. 2, item 14, Col. 2, Lines 59-65).

Matthews does not disclose displaying the at least one character on a display as a vector graphics message; receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete; and adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message.

Barsness et al. teaches vector graphic image representative of the hand written notes made by a user (col. 8, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Barsness et al. into Matthews system to displaying the at least one character on a display as a vector graphics message; receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete; and adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message in order to display user created comments (messages) (col. 4, lines 3-16 in the Barsness et al. reference).

As to claim 10, Matthews teaches a computer product recorded on a data carrier for causing a mobile device (See Col. 1, Lines 6-9), to carry steps of:

accepting a touch sensitive surface (See Fig. 1, item 10, Col. 2, Lines 41-43) (See Fig. 1, item 10) at least one stroke (See Fig. 1, item 10) of text made up of at least one character (See Col. 2, Lines 1-12);

encoding the strokes entered in a vector graphic format (See Fig. 2, item 12, from Col. 2, Line 65 to Col. 3, Line 9);

storing the encoded strokes (See Fig. 2, item 14, Col. 2, Lines 59-65).

Matthews does not disclose displaying the at least one character on a display; receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete; and adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message.

Barsness et al. teaches vector graphic image representative of the hand written notes made by a user (col. 8, lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Barsness et al. into Matthews system to

displaying the at least one character on a display; receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete; and adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message in order to display user created comments (messages) (col. 4, lines 3-16 in the Barsness et al. reference).

2. Claims 2,6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews and Barsness et al. in view of LeKuch et al. (US Patent 6,867,765 B2).

Matthews and Barsness et al. do not disclose aerial and code for causing the electronic device to combine strokes representing a plurality of characters and to transmit the combined strokes as a message via the aerial over a mobile network.

LeKuch et al. teaches aerial and code for causing the electronic device to combine strokes representing a plurality of characters and to transmit the combined strokes as a message via the aerial over a mobile network (See Fig. 2, items 40,60,200, Col. 4, Lines 3-54).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of LeKuch et al. into Matthews and Barsness et al. system in order to accurately associate physical written information with an electronic presentation (See Col. 2, Lines 8-10 in the LeKuch et al. reference).

3. Claims 3,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, Barsness et al. and LeKuch et al. in view of Holt et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0169289 A1).

Matthews, Barsness et al. and LeKuch et al. do not disclose the scalable vector graphics format.

Holt et al. teaches the scalable vector graphics format (See paragraph 0030).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Holt et al. into Matthews, Barsness et al. and LeKuch et al. system in order to accommodate limited screen size (See paragraph 0030 in the Holt et al. reference).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4,8-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claims 4,8 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art ofrecord (Matthews and Barsness et al.) and the instant invention is that the code records strokes representing one or more characters in the memory without carrying out character recognition on the or each character.

Claim 9 depend on claim 8.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3,5-7,10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Telephone Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
10.06.07

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER